

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 9, 23, and 31-32 are currently amended. No claims are currently cancelled. Claims 13-22 and 24 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Withdrawn claims 13 and 19 are currently amended. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in Applicant's specification at page 4, lines 14-26 and page 9, lines 10-12. Reconsideration and continued examination of the application is requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-12, 23, and 25-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious and unpatentable over Gurusamy et al. (US 6,361,423) in view of Manfredi et al. (US 5,785,585), and further in view of Sung (US 6,679,243).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to include a limitation that the matrix material comprises a brazing alloy and a corrosion resistant powder selected from at least one of stainless steel, nickel, nichrome, titanium, zirconium, tungsten carbide, silicon carbide, wherein said corrosion resistant powder comprises from 40% to 98% by weight of said matrix material. Applicant does not understand the cited combination of references to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing limitation.

Applicant has amended independent claims 23 and 31 to include a limitation that the carrier is affixed to the bottom substrate surface by at least one of an adhesive or mechanical fasteners. Claim 23 has also been amended to read that the carrier contacts the entire bottom substrate surface. Applicant does not understand the cited combination of references to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing limitation.

Applicant respectfully contends that the present amendments to pending independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 31 render moot the Patent Office's rejection of the claims over Gurusamy et al. in view of Manfredi et al., and further in view of Sung. For at least this reason, Applicant has overcome the Patent Office's rejection of the pending claims as allegedly obvious over the cited combinations of references. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-12, 23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable as

purportedly obvious over the cited references has been overcome, and should be withdrawn. Other reasons for withdrawal of the rejections also exist.

**Request for Rejoinder**

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 13-22 and 24 differ from the allowable claims only with respect to the limitation that the carrier comprises polycarbonate, and that a polycarbonate carrier is a species falling within the scope of the allowable generic linking claims 1 and 23. Withdrawn claims 13-22 and 24 thus incorporate all of the claim features of currently amended patentable claim(s) 1-12. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in its reply dated January 18, 2005. Accordingly, it is submitted that they are likewise patentable. Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of claims 13-22 and 24 under 37 CFR 1.104.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Rejoinder of the withdrawn claims and prompt allowance of all pending claims is solicited at an early date. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney to resolve any remaining questions.

Respectfully submitted,

October 16, 2008  
Date

By: /James A. Baker/  
James A. Baker, Reg. No.: 44,520  
Telephone No.: 651-736-9667

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833